

**REMARKS**

Claims 2, 17-22, 25-27, and 30 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. Applicants have amended claims 2 and 26 to define the claimed invention more particularly. Applicants have canceled claims 6, 8, 23, 28, and 29 without prejudice or disclaimer.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicants specifically state that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 2, 17-20, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischerkeller, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,371,153; hereinafter “Fischerkeller”) in view of Danna (U.S. Patent No. 5,221,021). Claims 6, 8, 21-23, and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischerkeller in view of Danna and Bailey (EP 0203711).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in the following discussion.

**I. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES**

The Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Fischerkeller with Danna to teach the claimed invention of claims 2, 17-20, and 26. Furthermore, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Fischerkeller with Danna and Bailey to teach the claimed invention of claims 6, 8, 21-23, and 27-30. Applicants submit, however, that, even if combined, the alleged combinations of

references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, neither of the alleged combinations of references teaches or suggests, “*wherein the bead portion is disposed immediately below and apart from a chamber module including a fuel pump arranged on the inside of the fuel tank, the bead portion including a plurality of arcuate bead portions arranged in a circular pattern and cut portions formed among the respective bead portions, the arcuate bead portions respectively providing an arrow mark indicating a recycle thereon*”, as recited in exemplary claim 1 and similarly recited in exemplary claim 26.

The Examiner alleges, “Danna teaches a bead portion below a chamber module.” (See Office Action dated June 17, 2008 at page 2).

Danna, however, does not teach or suggest a bead portion including a plurality of arcuate bead portions arranged in a circular pattern and cut portions formed among the respective bead portions, the arcuate bead portions respectively providing an arrow mark indicating a recycle thereon.

Indeed, none of the cited documents relates to a recycle technology. Even if the references are combined, as alleged by the Examiner, the references do not suggest providing an arrow mark for indicating the recycle on the bead disclosed in Danna.

A marking of the recycle as claimed is an evidence that the subject matter of the present invention relates to the recycle technology. The marking of the recycle cannot be led from the cited references, because the cited references are not directed to the recycle technology.

Therefore, Applicants submit that, even if combined, the alleged combinations of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Serial No. 10/813,054 8  
Docket No. F05-169600M/KQK  
(NGB.385)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

## **II. STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

As a preliminary matter, Applicants' representative would like to thank the Examiner for courtesies extended in the telephonic interview conducted on September 12, 2008.

The Examiner issued an Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTOL-413), which was mailed to Applicants' representative on September 15, 2008.

Applicants submit this Statement to comply with the requirements of M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

In the interview, Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed the following:

**A. Identification of claims discussed:**

Claims 2 and 26.

**B. Identification of prior art discussed:**

Prior art of record.

**C. Identification of principal proposed amendments:**

Applicants' representative proposed amending the claims to recite "*wherein the bead portion is disposed immediately below and apart from a chamber module including a fuel pump arranged on the inside of the fuel tank, the bead portion including a plurality of arcuate bead portions arranged in a circular direction and cut portions formed among the respective*

bead portions, the arcuate bead portions respectively providing an arrow mark indicating a recycle thereon”.

**D. Brief Identification of principal arguments:**

Applicants’ representative respectfully pointed out that the cited references do not teach or suggest “*wherein the bead portion is disposed immediately below and apart from a chamber module including a fuel pump arranged on the inside of the fuel tank, the bead portion including a plurality of arcuate bead portions arranged in a circular direction and cut portions formed among the respective bead portions, the arcuate bead portions respectively providing an arrow mark indicating a recycle thereon*”.

**E. Results of the Interview:**

In response to the arguments presented, the Examiner suggested replacing the phrase “circular direction” with the phrase “circular pattern”, and indicated that the proposed amendment would overcome the prior art rejections in the Office Action dated June 17, 2008 (see Examiner’s Interview Summary dated September 15, 2008).

**III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submit that claims 2, 6, 8, 17-23, and 25-30 , all of the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance,

Serial No. 10/813,054 10  
Docket No. F05-169600M/KQK  
(NGB.385)

Applicant requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: September 17, 2008

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott M. Tulino, Esq.  
Registration No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.  
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
LAW GROUP, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, VA 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
**Customer No. 21254**